

# IDEA Advisory Meeting

## MINUTES

DECEMBER 11, 2014

9:00 A.M. – 4:15 P.M.

COMFORT INN

MEETING CALLED BY	Cathy Haarstad, Chairperson
TYPE OF MEETING	IDEA Advisory Meeting
FACILITATOR	Gerry Teevens
NOTE TAKER	Michelle Souther
ATTENDEES	Gerry Teevens, Michelle Souther, Amanda Carlson, Kathy Schauer, Debra Huber, Kevin McDonough, Leona Zemliska, Cindy Lund, Shannon Grave, Lucy Fredericks, Ed Boger, Robin Tschider, Vicki Peterson, Colette Fleck, Michelle Hoechst, Brenda Oas, Susan Wagner, MacKenzie Dutchuk, Valerie Bakken, Nancy Skorheim, Katherine Terras, Robert Parisien, Matthew McCleary

## Agenda topics

Presentation on 2013-14 Indicator Data –  
SPP/APR Targets for Indicators

SUSAN WAGNER

DISCUSSION	<p>States are required by law to submit an Annual Performance Report every year to the federal government on the 20 indicators.</p> <p>Indicator 1: Graduation Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. North Dakota did not meet this target. Students with disabilities in North Dakota can stay in school until they are 21. The APR has the data for the 5-year extended and 7-year extended year cohort data. North Dakota is in the middle compared to other states in 12-13 graduation rates. The target for Indicator 1 is 89%.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Drop Out Rate: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. North Dakota met this target. North Dakota is on the higher end for drop-out. The reason North Dakota is the second highest next to Colorado is because of the way North Dakota calculates the drop-out rate. Target is 19.50% for this indicator. We met this target. The target is set to go to 17% in 2018-19.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment Participation Rate – Reading. North Dakota did not meet the target. Compared to other states North Dakota has high participation rates. The 3b target is 95%. North Dakota did not meet the target for 3C proficiency rates in Reading and Math. The percentage rate was 49.30% for 13-14 and the target for 14-15 is 100%. There was a concern by the committee that the percentage rate in North Dakota is dropping. The special education units range from 0-71% in Math proficiency rate. The range for Reading was 9-70% for special education units.</p> <p>Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion Rate: Rate of suspension and expulsion for students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. North Dakota met the target for Indicator 4. Indicator 4B is the rate of suspension/expulsion by race/ethnicity. North Dakota met the target for Indicator 4B. The target for 4a is .97%. The target for 4b is set by OSEP and has to be 0%.</p> <p>Indicator 5: LRE for students – percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served. North Dakota met the target. North Dakota was the highest among the MPRRC states at 77.61% for 5a. The target for 5A is 75.10%. The target for 5B is 4.60%. The target for 5C is 2.00% for 2014-15.</p> <p>Indicator 6: LRE for Preschool Students – Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. North Dakota is one of the lowest states in this indicator within the MPRRC states at 30.60%. Nancy explained that every state has different understanding of definition of the regular education environment which might explain why we are one of the lowest. The target for 6A for 2018-19 is 29.60% from 27.30% for 2014-15%. The target for 6B is 28.80% for 2014-15 to 26.50% for 2018-19.</p> <p>Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. Indicator 7 comes from ND Early Childhood Outcomes Summary form from Tienet. The data is verified by</p>
------------	--

	<p>a comparison of Tienet Indicator 7 unit verified report from July 2014 and the final Tienet unit 7 report. The target for 7A1 was 83.50% and 7A2 63% for 2014-15. The target for 2018-19 7A1 is set for 84.50% and 7A2 at 64%. North Dakota met this target. The target for 7B is 84% and 7B2 is 55% for 2014-15. The target for 2018-19 is 7B is 85% and 7B2 is 56%. The target for 7C for 2014-15 is 80.50% for 7C2 72%. The target for 2018-19 for 7C is 81.5 and 7C2 is 73%.</p> <p>Indicator 8: Parent Involvement – percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. The parent survey is posted on ND Department of Public Instruction at <a href="http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/speced1/family/family.shtm">http://www.dpi.state.nd.us/speced1/family/family.shtm</a>. We used a new sampling method. North Dakota's response rate was 11.9% for 2013-14. North Dakota's response rate is in the middle compared to other states. North Dakota's percentage for 2014-15 was 70.80%. Target for 2018-19 is set for 73.10% which would be based on the number of parents that report parent satisfaction on the survey.</p> <p>Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation – percent of districts that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. OSEP sets the target for this indicator which is at 0%.</p> <p>Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Category – percent of districts that had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. North Dakota met the target for this indicator. OSEP sets the target for this indicator which is at 0%.</p> <p>Indicator 11: Evaluation in 60 days – percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 60 days. The data is collected through Tienet. North Dakota did not meet this target. OSEP's target is 100%.</p> <p>Indicator 12: Transition from Part C to Part B – percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. North Dakota met this target as the target is 100%.</p> <p>Indicator 13: Transition planning on IEP by age 16 – percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals. North Dakota did not meet the target for this indicator. North Dakota's rate was 98.38% for 2013-14 which was an increase from 2012-13 at 86.31%. There were 374 files reviewed for this indicator. Dr. Ed O'Leary was brought in this year to help training teachers on this indicator. North Dakota's target for this indicator is 100%.</p> <p>Indicator 14: Post-Secondary Outcomes – percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in post-secondary education/training or employed. North Dakota's rate for 2013-14 was 29.89% for Indicator 14A. The targets for 14A for 2014-15 is 30.09% to 32.39% for 2018-19. North Dakota's rate for 2013-14 was 56.52% for Indicator 14B. The target for 14B for 2014-15 is 56.72% to 59.02% for 2018-19. North Dakota's rate for 2013-14 was 80.98% for Indicator 14C. The target for 14C for 2014-15 is 81.18% to 83.48% for 2018-19.</p> <p>Matthew McCleary thought maybe it would be better to survey transition students with similar questions as the parent survey while they are still in school. Instead of just asking dropout students ask every student the question about preparation after high school for Indicator 14.</p> <p>Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions – if states have fewer than 10 they don't have to report the data.</p> <p>Indicator 16: Mediation - percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements - if states have fewer than 10 they don't have to report the data.</p>	
CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

--	--	--

## SSIP Presentation

KEVIN MCDONOUGH

DISCUSSION	Kevin has held two stakeholders meetings. The three elements that were discussed and decided on with the stakeholders were: determined the following SiMR		
	The North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, in cooperation with our local and state level colleagues, will increase the graduation rate for students identified with emotional disturbance, as measured by the subgroup’s annual graduation rate determined through the calculations made in Indicator1 of the state’s SPP/APR.		
	The SiMR has been approved by Kirsten Baesler, Superintendent of Public Instruction. The committee members that attended the SSIP meeting thought that there was a lot of good discussion among different agencies and that the process was productive and meaningful.		
	The following five strategies were created		
	<div><div>1.</div><div>Cooperation with local and state level partners, NDDPI will develop a local level continuous improvement planning process. The goals and activities identified in this process would be entered into the Continuous Improvement Plan of each school within the LEAs of the local special education unit.</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Will provide technical assistance and financial resources to assist local level special education units to conduct such planning processes that result in the identification of evidence based practices to be implemented in their programs.</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Will assist and support local special education units, in cooperation with their LEAs to design and deliver quality professional development regarding evidence based practices.</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>Will assist local units to monitor progress and evaluate efforts.</div></div> <div><div>5.</div><div>Will assist other private and public agencies to promote an increase in the availability of public and private mental health services for students identified with mental health needs, including those with emotional disturbance.</div></div>		
CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

## Annual Dispute Resolution Report

ROBIN TSCHIDER

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	Options for Dispute Resolution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitated IEP</li> <li>• Mediation</li> <li>• Complaint Investigation</li> <li>• Due Process</li> <li>• Resolution Meeting</li> </ul> <p>Mediation and Resolution Hearings are also indicators for the SPP/APR.</p> <p>Resolution- Indicator 15</p>

	<p>Mediation - Indicator 16</p> <p>Resolution – is for parents to discuss the issues of the due process complaint and so school and parents can attempt to resolve the issues. A resolution meeting MUST take place before a due process hearing can occur.</p> <p>Mediation- a trained impartial mediator brings the parties together to work with each other to resolve significant disagreements that may or may not be related to an IEP.</p> <p>Two requests for mediation were received – one received but other party didn't agree to mediate. One mediation meeting was held but resulted in no agreement.</p> <p>IEP Facilitation – this is specific to the IEP. This meeting includes an impartial facilitator who assists the IEP team in developing an acceptable IEP. The number of requests for IEP facilitations has increased for DPI. IEP Facilitation is not required under IDEA.</p> <p>Complaint Investigations – a formal complaint is filed that indicates IDEA Law is not being followed by school district or local public agency. Three requests for complaints – one was fully investigated – two did not meet IDEA for investigation. A complaint must allege a violation that occurred not more than one year prior to the date that the complaint is received.</p> <p>Due Process – there were four requests for 2013-14.</p> <p>Robin handed out the Parent Resources Guides that were created by CADRE to the committee.</p>	
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>Cathy recommended that a presentation that addresses the issue of helping parents understand the dispute resolution options be brought up at the Leadership Institute with the special education directors. Pathfinders would like their contact information available on special education unit websites.</p>	
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>

### Behavior Coaching (SPDG)

BRENDA OAS

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>MTSS Behavior Coaching Process – Dr. Don Kincaid has been presenting information to two cohort groups.</p> <p>What is PBIS (MTSS Behavior):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The application of evidence-based strategies and systems to assist schools to             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve academic performance</li> <li>enhance school safety</li> <li>decrease problem behavior</li> <li>establish positive school cultures</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The PBIS Team Coaching Model includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interpersonal Communication</li> <li>Content Knowledge</li> <li>Data-Based Problem Solving</li> </ul> <p>Cohort #1 – Year 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grand Forks</li> <li>West Fargo</li> <li>Finley-Sharon</li> <li>Hatton,</li> <li>MPCG</li> <li>Valley City</li> <li>Wahpeton</li> </ul> <p>Cris Deaver has trained more than 40 staff members in three days of PBIS training.</p> <p>Cohort #2 – Year 1</p>
-------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Berthold</li> <li>Burke Central</li> <li>Max</li> <li>Surrey</li> <li>United Public – Des Lacs</li> <li>Wilton</li> <li>Hebron</li> </ul> <p>PBIS Evaluation Coaches’ Monthly Meeting – Dr. Don Kincaid</p> <p>These materials were created by the University of South Florida.</p> <p>Evaluation Questions:</p> <p>Are we doing what we said we would do?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PBS implementation</li> <li>Implemented with fidelity</li> </ul> <p>Is it working?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sustainability of implementation</li> <li>benefits for students over time</li> <li>benefits for staff</li> <li>benefits to the community</li> </ul> <p>Suggested Evaluation Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mid-Year 1 &amp; 2 Reports</li> <li>End of year report: suggested due date: at end of school year</li> </ul> <p>Pathfinders created a parent survey to see how much parents know about MTSS. West Fargo is the first school to use the survey.</p>
--	---

CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

#### Medication Dispensing in Schools

GERRY TEEVENS

DISCUSSION	Gerry handed out School Nursing Medication Administration Q and A document that addresses some examples of questions/scenarios that school nurses face every day. The department has been working with districts on a case by case situation. Some districts interpreted the law that unless they had a school nurse they couldn't give the medication. This issue will be likely addressed during the legislative session this year.		
CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

#### Priorities for the Year

CATHY HAARSTAD

DISCUSSION	The IDEA Committee priority chosen for the 2014-15 year was the State Systemic Improvement Plan.		
	Interest areas related to this priority that were flagged by the committee include:		
	<div><div>1.</div><div>Results Driven Accountability</div></div> <div><div>2.</div><div>Teaching Standards (shortages) – DPI could provide more information on the traineeship program and resident teacher scholarship</div></div> <div><div>3.</div><div>Preschool LRE</div></div> <div><div>4.</div><div>Parent Involvement</div></div>		
CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS		PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

<b>SUGGESTIONS SUMMARY</b>		
<p><b>Issues and Concerns in our State:</b></p> <p>Debra Huber brought up the concern of the oil impact regarding more demand on the schools. There was a survey conducted by NDCPD a study a couple of years ago and we haven't heard anything since. Is there anything as a committee that we could help guide DPI to help schools that are struggling with this issue? Gerry will take this concern to management at DPI. We would like the study to come from DPI not just special education.</p> <p>There is an increase in the number of children that are homeless.</p> <p>There are 4,200 homeless students in North Dakota based on recent data. The committee had a discussion regarding the growth in North Dakota regarding the homeless issue.</p> <p>Pathfinders has been receiving calls from parents regarding the qualifications of teachers in the state.</p> <p>Cathy expressed a concern that the number of preschool students educated in the LRE is significantly less than the number of school-aged students and would appreciate more information on that indicator from DPI.</p>		

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<p>The September Minutes were approved by the committee. Ed Boger approved the motion to accept the minutes and Amanda Carlson seconded the motion.</p> <p>Public Comment: There was no public comment.</p> <p>March's meeting is scheduled for March 5, 2015. June's meeting is scheduled for June 11, 2015. Joint ICC/IDEA Advisory in the morning and IDEA Advisory in the afternoon.</p> <p>Agenda Items for March meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSIP – 6 year targets need to be set</li> <li>• Legislative Update</li> <li>• Statewide Concerns</li> <li>• Alternate Assessment/State Assessment Update</li> </ul> <p>Parent Involvement Conference is scheduled for April 9-11, 2015 in Bismarck at the Radisson.</p> <p>Secondary Transition Interagency Conference is November 18 and 19, 2015 in Bismarck at the Ramada Hotel.</p>		